

3/27/2008

Org Group conf Call:

Participants:

Eric Frohberg, Tony, Jim Leach, Ken Bogdan, Brian Toal, Sharee, Gary G., Gary B., Margarget, Tim McCauly, Pam Schnepfer

Anything added to Agenda? No.

1. Redlines - what can be accepted for next draft vs. not.

Anything folks want me to not accept for the next draft.

Tony – will send typo corrections.

NY – still have reservations about conclusions in Tox chapter. Ken - use of the words “suggests no margin of safety” is kind of a strong . Would expect that we will have to develop some sort of official position and ... still debating within ourselves whether we agree or disagree with the conclusionary statements in tox chapter.

Gary – I think that the key point regarding the body burden issue as I just reviewed the doc it is not look at how affecting advisory approach – and where we need statements like that to support one recommendation or another. The approach is important as a cross check against a risk approach. We were careful about not presenting it as the only approach. And we included uncertainties.

Margaret – more general question – in terms of process. I think there will be issues on the wording in the chapter. And that people have different views on this – if we were to go back and review this – if we don't feel adequate data to support a particular sentence or conclusions – how to approach that in a way that is efficient.

Eric – not our job to re-write chapters. The org group may want to revisit issues brought up in chapters and comment on the level of confidence.

Ken - understand the body burden is not to be the sole approach. We can agree to disagree.

Gary G. - have to realize the tox chapter and conclusions stop short that the concentrations in STB compare to everything else. And leave it up to the future for individual states to do that analysis. We raise body burden but never bring it full cycle. What are the implications of that analysis – that is my one discomfort in raising the issue and not bringing it to the logical fruition.

NY – Hard to do given the severe limitations of the data on PCBs in commercial foods.

Gary – And we've made the uncertainties clear, and given the data made the best available use of that limited data. We need more data gathering

Jim - Limited amount of that in the benefits discussion. Meat comparison.

Gary G. Never draw the circle – just presented it.

Jim - I think that is a good choice, data limitations are so wide -

2. Conclusions Chapter

Conclusions outline:

Introduction

Discussion from Subworkgroups

A. Data Subworkgroups

B. Biology Subworkgroup

C. Health Effects Subworkgroup

D. Advisories Subworkgroup

Proposed Core Consumption Advisories

Striped Bass

Options for Advisories (from Tox Chapter)

Proposed Sensitive Subpop Advice – includes fish ingestion rate discussion

(summary of states advice?) – needed?

:Proposed General Pop Advice

Summary

Bluefish

Proposed Sensitive Pop Advice

General Pop Advice

Summary of proposed advice

Risk Communication

Uncertainties and Research Recommendations

Data

Biology

Health Effects

Advis

Org

Conclusions

E – Move Gary's discussion a bit forward?.

OK

E Content – as is, or add revisit benefits, risk assessment approach, risk management approach?

NY – Ken – We think it would make sense on risk assessment approach.

Gary – we surprised that it was lifted from the tox chapter and put in conclusion chapter.

Thought could be abstracted to a relatively short paragraph and kept in tox chapter.

Towards background exposure – and instead in place of this, but say that the tox chapter identified using standard risk methodology, main derivation of advisories, etc., looking at

cancer, and also body burden with some abstraction of this. Rather than have this in the conclusions chapter

E – this was a discussion in the tox group – agreed to put it in the conclusions.

Deb – agree should be in tox chapter. Extracted here. Along with mention of RA approach.

Ken – called “options for development of stb advisory”. Don’t understand how in the tox chapter. I agree more with what Gary suggested. Thinking that there are three approaches and one of those approaches. The way it is written here is that it is the primary approach.

Gary G – we are saying the same thing. If this can be folded back into the tox chapter. Wouldn’t want it lifted totally from the tox chapter.

Jim – don’t want to forget about body burden – changing the title using body burden for developing advisories for fish, rather than specifically striped bass.

E – does summary and conclusions of the health effects section adequately address this issue.

Ken - Quite lengthy to read to make recommendations on the short term. Make generic then OK. Put at end of BB section – leave summary conclusions the way it is.

Agreed to move this discussion back into tox section – and replacing it with a summary of that? But in a more generic way – don’t title it striped bass – options for developing a fish advisory for

Gary – I think it is a little hard to take out the relevance of striped bass and bluefish as the whole document is about STB and blf. Clearly the reason we are talking about STB and BLF is that they are somewhat elevated. In our case, STB and BLF are what are on the table.

Ken – good point.

Eric – so move it back to tox section - OK with that?

Jim – generally agree with moving it back, but still have concerns. Will remain unresolved.

Ken – do you have a way to nuance? I think I sent Eric a version of that? **Ken will send email to Tox and Org Group.** I think I’m talking about a few sentences in a few places.

Deb – still keep a short paragraph here, talking about every option for developing advice. One paragraph. **Eric will do.**

3. Advice
4. Striped Bass
 1. no consumption sensitive
 2. meal per month, rest

Decision to drop Tables summarizing the states advice? – yes.

Margaret – I’m still unclear as an organizational committee? If we support advice, what does this mean for our state?

Gary G – it is available for the states to consider. You as a state are not endorsing this.

Tony – I guess the idea is that states have their own way of doing business. If a state doesn’t adopt any proposed advice – I’m not sure if that is an issue including possibly our state. If not the agency position – if the staff proposed it – is that a problem? Is that what you are talking about Margaret?

Margaret – yes, can’t make that decision on my own. Even tho we are suggesting it as a proposal. There is something that happens when you do propose an advisory.

Eric – well, is it worth revisiting whether proposing any advice is the goal of the group? We can either propose advice, propose a series of options for advice, or not propose advice.

Tony – don’t want to create a lot more work. After hearing Margaret talk – I think leaving it as options – would probably make our participation easier. I don’t want to take all the meaning out of the document. Everyone knows they have various options for the states. Like to have uniform, how we get there may differ from various states. Producing options on how to get to uniform advisory.

NY votes for options. Might be preferable.

Gary – in hearing this from Mass and NY – fine with me if you want to water down the document, I don’t think the big new story is that a bunch of states got together to come up with an options document. What they are going to care about is what you are telling folks what you are telling pregnant women what they are going to eat. The newsworthy story is going to be “here is what our advice is going to be”. If we have a joint press release that are endorsing this document and here is how we are implementing it.

Margaret – I think that by today, if today the org group recommends specific advisories, that is based on our agreement of how we view the science. I don’t know if we can do that. Don’t know if we need a line or two. Do not have consensus. In the bottom line, we may not agree. If we propose options..

Brian – what do you mean by options? Change proposed consumptions to options for advisories? Or listing all possible advice out there.

Margaret – not possible for us to support a proposed advisory.

Brian - What do you mean by options?

Margaret – so you participated in this process – you agreed that it was reasonable based on all this data. And you did that, but in your state you didn’t’ advice that? How do you support that? How would I respond to that?

Brian == this has been on the table for a year and a half for mass to decide on. If you can't sign on, you can't sign on. I don't think our process should be slowed down by states who don't see it in their future to set health based consumption advisory limits based on the RfD. If you are not in that discussion, then you shouldn't sign on. Will put yourself on your in a compromised position.

Margaret?- don't want to stop the process want some flexibility.

Not something to sign on our not. An ad hoc group process. Not a consensus building process.

Tony . Could be a valuable tool for us. An easy way to deal with this – Margaret suggested some language. The statement she said about something to the effect that if the state agrees – here is an advisory that they could adopt. Maybe a couple places if needed. I think it would help us.

Brian – sounds ok

Tony and Margaret will make those changes and send them to Eric.

E – so....one advisory – proposed – with appropriate qualifications as to what proposed means.

E – are folks OK with 1 meal per month and no consumption.

CT – ok with us.

NY – not sure what we (NY) are going to derive. Still looking at various factors.

E – Shall we leave as is?

T – don't have anything to say. Sorry I'm rambling on. If we offer the language you described would be a big step. The advisory we recommend – when we are ready to do that, ready to move ahead.

E – so, keep as is.

E – how are folks feeling. It is 11:14 – push on or deal with bluefish next conf call when we can have Rick and Jack on the line?

Gary G – Rick is the Main mover and shaker on the size issue I vote to put it off til next conference.

5. Large Bluefish

1. no consumption sensitive
2. meal per month, rest

6. Small Bluefish - in particular what the advice is, and what the justification is.

Breakpoint – 20", 14"?

1. Sensitive – 1 meal/month? No consumption?

2. 1 meal per week – general?

Anything else?

7. Timeline - Wrap up by end of April. Tony – one request – if you see your state issuing an advisory – think it would be good to notify everyone that we can.
Brian – will probably hold off til later in the spring – will coordinate if do.

Tony and Margaret will give me language in 2 weeks.

Next meeting

Friday April 11th – 10 AM